



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/691,237	10/19/2000	David S. Wells	085747/0170	5026

7590 05/02/2003

Stephen A. Bent  
FOLEY & LARDNER  
Washington Harbour  
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 500  
Washington, DC 20007-5109

EXAMINER

CHANNAVAJJALA, LAKSHMI SARADA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1615

DATE MAILED: 05/02/2003

17

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/691,237	WELLS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Lakshmi S Channavajjala	1615

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 11 April 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1.  A Notice of Appeal was filed on 11 February 2003. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2.  The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
  - (a)  they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c)  they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5.  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) rejected: 1-34.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8.  The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.
9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Rork et al teaches controlled release compositions with a continuous or a pre-determined rate and teaches inclusion of hypnotics and anxiolytics. While Rork et al teaches diethylisovaleramide, the motivation to replace the compound of Rork comes from the disclosure of Balandrin, which recognizes isovaleramide as an anxiolytic and sedative (abstract). The expected result is to achieve the same hypnotic and sedative effect as that of diethylisovaleramide. With respect to the declaration dated 4-11-03, examiner has withdrawn the rejection of claims 1-5,7-11,14-20,22-2 and 29-34 over Rork alone. However, examiner maintains the rejection of claims over Rork et al in view of Balandrin or vice versa. Applicants' argument with respect to the effect of isovaleramide is not persuasive because applicants own admission on page 1 of specification and the teaching of Balandrin shows that isovaleramide is a known anxiolytic and sedative. Further, applicants argue that Rork teaches a particular type of sustained release formulations. However, instant claims also require only "sustained-release formulation" and does not distinguish from that of Rork. Accordingly, the argument that isovaleramide has a shorter half-life than diethylisovaleramide is not persuasive because instant claims do not state as to the duration over which the release active agent takes place. Absent such, it is within the scope of a skilled artisan to use isovaleramide or diethylisovaleramide with an expectation to achieve anxiolytic and sedative effects for a desired time period. Accordingly, the rejection has been maintained.

Parada  
LAKSHMI CHANNAVALLALA  
Examiner  
AU 1615